

Taskforce  
Accountability and Autonomy  
Work Team  
Status Update

Report to the Structure and Governance Committee

June 2014

# Accountability and Autonomy Work Team Progress

- Plan: Research, consider options, and make recommendations
- Research work to date
  - Research Massachusetts and Louisiana
  - Review Idaho's current accountability system (5 star system)
  - Interview group of Idaho Superintendents
- Upcoming
  - Survey of Idaho School Board Trustees and Superintendents
  - Review of existing State laws and rules for Idaho Schools
  - Draft recommendations

# Accountability

- Empirically based – focused on student achievement and progressing toward the 60% goal; and must include assistance/support, not just accountability
- Attributes
  - Must be clear, concise, uniform, simple, and transparent
  - Must align with the 60% goal and progress towards the 60% goal
  - Focused on leadership, not on buildings or organizations
  - Interventions should be primarily supportive, not punitive
- Potential Measures
  - Two elements to be measured
    - Achievement of the 60% goal (% of children that meet the standard)
    - Improvement towards the 60% goal (increase in the % of children that meet the above standard)
  - High schools:
    - > 60% of students graduate high school ready to go-on, without remediation (SAT >500)
    - School score is the lowest of the three SAT scores (lowest of Math, Reading, and Writing)
  - Elementary schools:
    - > 60% of students proficient (SBAC) by 8<sup>th</sup> grade – proficient meaning on track to SAT > 500
    - “Score” for a school is the lowest of the three scores (lowest of Math, Reading, and Language)
  - Other matters to be resolved...
    - Advanced Opportunity Participation
    - Sub Group Handling?
    - Intervention levels and model

# Accountability

## Core elements of the state-wide accountability system:

1. “Good -to-great” system
  - Focused on continuous improvement on a cyclical basis (annual)
  - Accountability system is clear; measures are transparent – and managed locally
  - State’s role is clear: uniform measurement, and support of collaboration / innovation
  - Basis should be % of students achieving the go-on level of learning;
  - Progress measures need to support continuous improvement - clear, focusing, and granular
2. “Intervention System” for struggling schools
  - Defines triggers for episodic intervention by the State into struggling schools
  - Defines what “interventions” are needed at different stages
  - State’s role is to provide outside assistance to support turnaround
  - Accountability focused on people – not institutions
  - Must not allow perpetual failure
  - Basis is the 5-star system ... with some key adjustments

# Autonomy

- Accountability systems should establish performance mandate that moves beyond minimal compliance and status quo
- Autonomy initiative
  - Must accompany the performance mandate, so that local people are empowered to make the changes they need to improve performance.
  - Eliminate unnecessary structure and rules that hamper/destroy innovation and ownership
- What is unnecessary
  - If the school is performing, do we care?
  - Does it create inefficiencies and local burden, without material value in return?
  - Does it prevent/hamper innovation and creativity?
- Three key areas:
  - Proscriptive/restrictive funding
  - Personnel decisions
  - Reporting requirements

# Annual planning

- CRITICAL FOCUS – Make continuous improvement the operating framework in every school
- Local people set clear, measurable goals for improvement – every year
- Forces awareness, transparency, and accountability for progressing to the 60%
- “Must haves”
  - Founded and focused on the 60% goal and making progress toward that goal
  - Focused, simple, and clear
  - Annual cadence
  - Locally driven school boards, administrators, and teachers - via clarity and transparency
  - State supports by clear, focused, uniform measures ... and collaboration systems

# Supporting Needs

1. Training on **continuous process improvement** methodologies
2. Training on data and metrics
3. Alignment of superintendent evaluations to academic outcomes and annual plan achievement ... i.e. a material part of the evaluation is progress toward 60% goal
4. Changes to the 5-Star Rating System:
  - Today – Good first pass... but needs work
    - Seems more focused on completeness, than focus, thus is confusing
    - Does work ... e.g. advance opportunity participation
    - Simultaneously too complicated (breadth of metrics, weighting), and overly simplistic (one rating per school for everything)
  - Improvements Needed
    - Adjust balance of metrics – more orientation towards achievement – esp. at high school
    - Don't confuse compliance/policy (federal) with performance achievement/improvement - Trying to make one thing do everything just makes it poor at everything
    - Clarity - is this “scorecard” for a school or an intervention system?
    - Do something with special needs schools